

In the Drawings:

Please replace Figures 1-5 on sheets 1-5 with new replacement Figures 1-5 on Replacement Sheets 1-5, enclosed herewith. No new matter has been added.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 12, 21, 27, 33, 36, 41, 48 and 52 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Claims 1-59 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Drawings Objection:

Replacement drawing sheets are submitted herewith in response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims Objection:

The Examiner objects to claims 21-32. The Examiner requests that claims 21 and 27 be amended to delete the word "source" and replace it with the word "first". However, the Examiner fails to give any reason why this change should be required. While Applicants do not believe any change is necessary, claims 21 and 27 have been amended for expediency as requested by the Examiner. Applicants assert that this amendment does not change the meaning or scope of the claims and is not made for any reason of patentability. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Section 101 Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 and 33-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that claims 1, 12, 33, 41, 48 and 52 "are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result [in] a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result." Applicants traverse this rejection. However, to expedite prosecution, claims 1, 12, 33, 41, 48 and 52 have been amended.

MPEP 2106.IV.B.2.(b) states that a process is statutory if it is “limited to a practical application in the technological arts” regardless of whether or not there is any pre- or post- process activity. The most famous example of this category is found in *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc.*, 149 F.3d 1368, 47 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1998) as discussed in MPEP 2106 where the court stated that the relevant claim was statutory because “the transformation of data, representing discrete dollar amounts, by a machine through a series of mathematical calculations into a final share price, constitutes a practical application ... because it produces ‘a useful, concrete and tangible result’ – a final share price”. Just like transforming data representing discrete dollar amounts to determine a final share price was considered a practical application and thus statutory in *State Street*, generating an association of each information object from a second set of information objects with the corresponding user from a set of users and with an additional resource is a practical application because it produces a useful, concrete and tangible result – the generated association. Thus, Applicants’ claims are statutory. *See also AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc.*, 172 F.3d 1352, 1358, 50 USPQ2d 1447, 1452 (Fed. Cir. 1999). MPEP 2106.II.A states: “Office personnel have the burden to establish a *prima facie* case that the claimed invention as a whole is directed to solely an abstract idea or to manipulation of abstract ideas or does not produce a useful result. Only when the claim is devoid of any limitation to a practical application in the technological arts should it be rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101.” (emphasis added). As discussed above, claims 1, 12, 33, 41, 48 and 52 each clearly recite a practical application in the technological arts. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request removal of the § 101 rejection.

CONCLUSION


Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicants hereby petition for such an extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-96801/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☐ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☒ Replacement Drawing Sheets 1-5

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: May 24, 2006